DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 232 RC 006 337

AUTHOR Schwarzweller, Harry K.
TITLE Adaptation of Appalachian Migrants to the Industrial Work Situation: A Case Study. Appalachian Center Research Report 2.
INSTITUTION West Virginia Univ., Morgantown.
REPORT NO WVU-Bull-S-69-12-7
PUB DATE May 69
NOTE 11p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; *Case Studies; *Family Structure; Group Unity; Job Satisfaction; Labor Problems; *Migrants; Occupational Mobility; Relocation; *Rural Areas; *Vocational Adjustment
IDENTIFIERS *Appalachia

ABSTRACT

The research findings reported in this paper, a revised version of a paper presented at the Conference on Migration and Behavioral Deviance, Puerto Rico, 1968, are drawn from a study designed to supplement the survey phase of the Beech Creek Study (1961)'. The aim of this research report is to investigate patterns of adaptation and reaction to the industrial work situation. Interviewed in 1962 were 20 male migrants from rural Appalachia. Additional information concerning the characteristic and stereotyped traits of Appalachian migrants was obtained in 1963 from industrial relations personnel, foremen, and union representatives in the various factories where many of the Beech Creekers worked. It was determined that close family relationships facilitated a smooth transition from farming to factory employment. Migrants' initial entry into the industrial labor market, their advancement in occupational status and their changes in place of work, their reaction to lay-offs and unions, and their job satisfactions are discussed. It was concluded that the Beech Creek stem-family served to stabilize the migrant's social world external to the factory by keeping off-the-job problems distinct from on-the-job performance. For these migrants, adaptation to an industrial occupation role merely required the acceptance of new work behavior standards and had little effect upon the more important aspects of their life situation. (HBC)

adaptation of appalachian migrants to the industrial work situation: A CASE STUDY[1]

RECEIVED
JUL 11 1972
NMSU

Harry K. Schwarzweller, Professor of Sociology, West Virginia University.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 066232

APPALACHIAN CENTER
RESEARCH REPORT 2
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

The process of adaptation to the industrial work situation encountered in the area of destination may be one of the more important sources of potential strain in the transitional adjustment of rural to urban migrants.[2] This is even more probable if the migrants were reared within a familistically-oriented social organization and accustomed to the self-directed work routine which characterizes the patterning of economic pursuits in relatively isolated, subsistence farming localities of Appalachia. An individual migrant from rural Appalachia, for example, has little opportunity prior to migration to acquire industrial-type work experiences in the area of origin. Upon arrival in the area of destination he seeks out and assumes a work role for which he may have very little, if any, preparation and which, moreover, is at once sharply differentiated from family activities. It seems inevitable that some kinds of strain result in the process of adaptation.[3] To the extent that the family-kinship system is responsive to the changing needs of the migrant — and this theme is pursued more specifically in other papers[4] — serious adjustment difficulties are probably avoided. For a proper understanding of the adaptation process, however, it is also necessary to take into account the nature of the industrial work situation in the area of destination. Indeed, the social context in receiving areas, which includes the industrial work situation **and** other aspects of the local community situation, probably determines the effectiveness and, perhaps, the very form of response by the family-kinship system to the changing needs of the migrant.

The aim of this paper is to explore, by descriptive analysis with some historical depth, the patterns of adaptation and reaction to the industrial work situation among a selected group of male migrants drawn from an isolated rural mountain locality in Appalachia. We are, of course, especially concerned with the functions performed by the kinship structure. Our thesis is that these, and perhaps other migrants from rural Appalachia, have adapted with a minimum amount of strain to existing circumstances in the host communities as the result of a combination of favorable factors: the demand for relatively unskilled labor by Ohio factories, the personalistic and paternalistic nature of the industrial work situation in receiving areas, the social and cultural similarities (i.e., normative equivalencies) which exist between the place of origin and destination of the migrants, and the supportive functions performed by the kinship network during the transitional period.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND STUDY POPULATION

The research findings reported here are drawn from a study[5] designed to supplement the survey phase of a larger project (The Beech Creek Study).

The Beech Creek Study is based upon and is an extension of an earlier study in 1942 by James S. Brown who, in the anthropological tradition, had as his main purpose "a description and analysis of the social organization of an isolated rural neighborhood in the Kentucky mountains".[6] He found that Beech Creek, as he called the locality, was a family-centered social system organized around the demands of subsistence agriculture and guided by the traditions of a frontier way of life. Kinship units, in those days, tended to be culturally insular groups, kinship relations the more meaningful interactional patterns, and familistic norms the more important mechanisms for social control. Familism, as a traditionally sanctioned value orientation, dominated the cultural configuration.

RC006337

For the Beech Creek Study, (i.e., the larger project), persons who were residents of Beech Creek in 1942 were followed up and interviewed at their places of residence in 1961. Since 1942, as one familiar with demographic transitions occurring in the southern Appalachians would surmise, there had been a considerable stream of out-migration from the mountain locality. By 1961, of the 319 Beech Creekers still living, 178 (or 56 percent) were residentially relocated, through the process of chain-migration, in areas outside Appalachia; interview data were obtained from 161 (or 90 percent). Most of the migrants (63 percent) live in and around the major metropolitan areas of southern Ohio and almost all of the remainder (35 percent) are located in other industrialized areas of Ohio and Indiana. Well over half of the migrants have lived for ten years or longer in areas outside the mountains. Most of the male migrants (59 percent) are today employed in manufacturing industries and generally at semi-skilled or unskilled jobs.

Through migration, Beech Creekers were seeking to enhance their economic lot in life, for the mountain neighborhoods of Appalachia no longer offered them the means to satisfy their needs and newly acquired wants. Like the earlier European immigrants who turned to America, they looked toward the promise of work opportunities in the Ohio Valley. They settled in urban or suburban communities in or near the centers of industry which were populated, for the most part, by similar migrants from Appalachia. Beech Creekers and the sociocultural system which they represented were, so to speak, "transplanted". Over the years, of course, in confrontation with urban society, Beech Creekers and their orientations were subjected to forces of change and modernizing influences that effected the very foundations of their way of life. The individual Beech Creeker found himself adjusting to, and having to adjust to, environmental circumstances in the area of destination and so also to the requisites of living as a participating member of mainstream America.

In order to explore the problem of the occupational adaptation of rural migrant workers, focused interviews of some length were conducted during the summer of 1962 with a selected group (N=30) of men from Beech Creek who were residing in or near the city of Cincinnati.[7] Almost all were married and had children. The median length of time they had lived outside Appalachia was 12 years with a range of from 5 to 20 years. The median years of schooling they had completed was eight; their median annual income in 1961 was $5500. Two were unemployed at the time. Most of the others were employed in factories, at skill levels ranging from "packer" to "finish-grinder" to "precision inspector". In general, the selected group was fairly representative of the male migrant population from Beech Creek.

A series of interviews was also obtained during the spring of 1963 from a number of industrial relations personnel, foremen, and union representatives in the various factories where many of the Beech Creekers worked.[8] As informants, they provided additional information about the characteristic and stereotyped "traits" of Appalachian migrants within the industrial work situation.

Data collection focused upon: (1) the social setting within which the institution of work is located (in terms of both the areas of origin and destination); (2) the period during which a migrant's reaction to and evaluation of his job and work situation occurred (which dealt with three "occupational time periods", namely, prior to migration, immediately after migration, and at the time of the interview); and (3) the specification of factors explaining occupational adaptation. This approach to the general problem was modified somewhat, on the basis of field experience and data interpretation.

The present paper summarizes our observations, emphasizing those more relevant to the stem-family hypothesis, which has been elaborated and discussed at length in an earlier paper,[9] and to a fuller understanding of the social context within which this form of familistic adjustment to changing environmental circumstances is located. The implicit objective is to suggest a useful sociological approach (in the holistic tradition) for the study of this multifaceted phenomenon, namely, the occupational adaptation of rural migrants.[10]

FROM FIELD TO FACTORY

The work situation in the mountain area of Appalachian Kentucky was, and to a considerable extent still continues to be, the antithesis of the work situation encountered by migrants in urban Ohio. Prior to migration most male migrants from Beech Creek were engaged in farm-

ing, either on a full-time or part-time basis, and this work was very often a family endeavor with responsibilities divided according to age and sex, and clearly articulated with other life activities. Some men, to be sure, had held supplementary jobs in the log-woods, in the mines, or as laborers on county road-construction projects and a few had worked at one time or other in factories in southern Ohio. But the rhythm of work life was in the main organized around, and tempered by the seasonal demands of subsistence agriculture. "Public work", as Beech Creekers called almost any kind of off-farm employment, required only a temporary separation of the individual from the family homestead and a man's obligation to do his share of the farming remained foremost.

Male migrants in Ohio generally reflect back favorably and with considerable nostalgia on their early life and work (experience) in the mountains. "Farming", they feel, "was good to grow up on". They recall the independence and sense of security it accords and the fact that farming is an outdoor activity with a great variety of tasks. Many would agree with the Beech Creeker who said, "If I could take my present job and move it back to the hills, I'd go in a minute".

Of course, as the latter suggests, farming in the Beech Creek area did not and does not offer the possibility of an adequate cash income. The difficulties of "making it on the farm" and the lack of occupational alternatives in the mountain region function as important "push" factors in stimulating out-migration and, likewise, provide a subsequent basis for comparison with the work situation in the area of destination. Most Beech Creekers, consequently, are not unhappy with their new work situations. As one migrant succinctly put it: "Any job here beats hell out of pounding rocks in Kentucky."

Migration to Ohio is an old pattern for the Beech Creek neighborhoods. Contemporary migrants undoubtedly move with the comforting knowledge that many before them — kinsfolk and neighbors — had been successful in making this transition and in adapting to the industrial work situation. Their prodecessors' obvious mastery of the situation (relatively few returned permanently) coupled with the visible spoils of victory (many visited home with new cars and other symbols of affluency) bolstered the confidence and undergirded the fortitude of these "new recruits" to the Ohio labor market.

Professor Slotkin in his book dealing with new factory employees describes one type of migrant as the "permanently uprooted"." These migrants perceive the donor culture (our terminology) in the area of origin as substantially and permanently inadequate, hence migration from the area is undertaken with expectations of permanency. We suggest, as a further elaboration of Slotkin's theory, that such "expectations of permanency" are directly tied in with the supportive functions performed by the kinship structure. From significant kin-group members in the area of destination, for example, the potential migrant secures information about the kinds of jobs available as well as some idea about the work expectations connected with these industral occupation roles. In this way, the potential migrant is significantly aided in formulating an image of work requisites in the factory vis-a-vis those of the farm. His kin are often able to supply details about a specific job "opening". The Beech Creek migrant therefore, who had fairly accurate information about the job situation in Ohio, was able to at least partially anticipate the industrial occupation role prior to migration; the event of migration was, from his point of view, the end-result of a rational decision and the manifestation of a firm resolve to accept the "punishment" which would be entailed in pursuing the "reward". Our data converge upon this conclusion. Indeed in numerous ways the transition from field to factory and the process of adaptation to the industrial work situation were begun long before the migrant left Beech Creek; the kin structure (i.e., the stem-family system) stabilized and managed the process.

INITIAL JOB SITUATION

Few if any Beech Creekers had kinfolk in the area of destination who were in a position to actually hire them. Employers in Ohio, however, not only recognized the importance of kin ties among Mountaineers but utilized the migrant kin network to secure an adequate labor supply, especially at the laborer and unskilled job levels. When job vacancies occurred, the word was passed along within the shop and, via the kin communication network, soon became common knowledge in the migrant community, quickly trickling down to families in the coves and hollows of Appalachia. Such personalized appeals were, and continue to be, far more effective than the mass media for drawing job applicants from

the mountain "labor pool". Moreover, a worker who is hired on the basis of references supplied by kinsfolk in that same factory is bound to be more reliable; family obligations are involved and family honor is at stake.

Indeed, it is common knowledge among migrants that some employers favor job applicants who have family connections within the plant; "unless your brother or your brother-in-law is working for them," said a Beech Creeker bluntly about a high-paying factory in the area, "there is no use in trying to get on". It is not unusual, therefore, to find many members of a family group working for the same firm; three brothers for example, and some of their cousins from Beech Creek are employed in one of the larger factories.

A few managerial personnel were of the opinion that hiring along kin lines is less prevalent nowadays than formerly. It had tended to create certain, rather unique problems. For example, as one informant put it: "We used to hire close relatives of our employees and if there was some emergency back in the mountains we would have a whole group of workers who took off to visit a sick aunt. This paternalistic attitude can backfire on you." Nevertheless, kin-hiring still appears to be an important technique used to secure employees for lower status jobs. As a result of this practice over the years, a type of homogeneity with respect to the workers' backgrounds and normative expectations was fostered in many work situations. Southern Appalachian migrants, for example, predominate in the light and heavy manufacturing industries around Cincinnati; in some plants the proportion of mountain-born workers is reported to be as high as seventy-five percent. It is not surprising, therefore, that few Beech Creekers encounter difficulties in getting along with native Ohioans in the work situation for, as they often exclaim, "there ain't no Buckeyes to get along with".

Beech Creekers generally, like most migrants from rural Appalachia, found their initial jobs in factories which did not require at the time of hiring any previous industrial experience or a high school diploma. This was fortunate because they came to the areas of destination generally ill-prepared for other than unskilled labor. Few had the advantage of any high school education. They were often hired to perform simple assembly-line tasks that were quickly learned with a minimal amount of on-the-job training. For instance, one Beech Creeker recalled that, "the boss took me to the place where I'd work and told a guy there to explain what I'd do . . . he did . . . it took about ten minutes". Similarly, a foreman explained that his plant "doesn't require any polish or a lot of education and the Briarhoppers know this by word of mouth and a lot of them come here". Another foreman reported that, "anyone can get a job here. They give an aptitude test, but hell, the whole thing depends on whether they have an opening or not." The type of work required by these industries seemed to have been designed to make use of the potential labor force in the nearby southern Appalachian region. One company official declared pointedly: "Our strongest appeal is our proximity to the mountains."

This proximity to Appalachia, which allows the migrant to maintain visiting ties with his family homestead, coupled with the supportive kin network in the area of destination and the minimal skill requirements demanded of the migrant by Ohio industry, facilitated the initial entry of the Beech Creekers into the industrial labor market. To be sure, the work that newcomers were expected to perform (for example, punch press operator) and the job context (a factory or shop situation) constituted new experiences for most Beech Creekers. It was, nevertheless, a relatively simple transition under the circumstances. Indeed, most Beech Creekers seem to have been quite satisfied with their first jobs in Ohio. Although their starting wages were not high (ranging, for example, from $0.60 to $2.60 an hour, with a median of $1.25 during 1941-1956 for the 30 men interviewed), what they earned was a great deal more than they could have expected in the mountains: and, more important, they **were** employed. Management, at least in terms of its past policies, tended to be paternalistic in its dealings with Appalachian migrants and, perhaps because of this, Beech Creekers regarded the initial work conditions as quite satisfactory. Getting along with co-workers offered no special difficulties; after all, most of them were also "Briarhoppers" from the mountains. The initial situation, from the migrant's perspective, provided an effective mechanism for allowing him to adapt gradually, and with integrity, to the demands of a machine technology.

ADVANCEMENT AND STABILITY

While the industrial work situation in southern Ohio was generally in accord with the needs and unskilled talents of beginning workers from rural Appalachia, these same initially favorable conditions made it possible, perhaps even necessary, for ambitious migrants after a year or so "to look around for better jobs". Some, to be sure, were encouraged to rise up through the ranks within the factory where they had started. Seniority rules, however, and other factors tied in with a particular firm's organization of manpower made such movement difficult. For the most part, and especially in the case of those who had begun at unskilled levels, these who had managed to acquire the basic industrial training for subsequent advancement, and were eager to capitalize on that experience, upward mobility toward higher paying, more skilled jobs often meant seeking out new employers. The relatively high rate of job turnover; i. e., interplant mobility, by Appalachian migrants in Ohio and elsewhere (a phenomenon quickly noted by observers) should not be interpreted as a sign of occupational insecurity or instability (a trait often attributed to these newcomers). Rather, it is more likely a consequence of the migrants' desire to get ahead, a behavioral manifestation of the "maturing" workers' realistic appraisal of the situation, and indeed an indication of the newcomers' adaptation to the demands and opportunities of the industrial labor market.

As a matter of fact, the Appalachian migrant is rather reluctant to change jobs because it not only entails moving into an unfamilar situation but also means that he must give up the security of accrued seniority rights. A foreman explained. "They have a great value for security and once they get to know their work group and boss they don't want to move. Also, they are sensitive about their lack of educational skills, which may be required in another job, so they tend to stay on the same job." To become upwardly mobile, however, the Appalachian migrant often must seek out a new job.

The general advancement in occupational status (and, of course, level of skill) over the years by Beech Creek migrants is striking. For example, of the 30 men we interviewed at length during this phase of our research, 21 had begun work in Ohio as unskilled laborers, 4 as semi-skilled, 2 as skilled, and 3 as farm workers. In 1962, 10 were still at an unskilled level (one temporarily unemployed), but 9 were semi-skilled (one temporarily unemployed), 9 skilled, 1 a salesman, and 1 a pool-room attendant (service). The proportion who were able to command a more skilled job had tripled and their wages reflect this increased status (ranging, in 1962, from $1.25 to $4.37 an hour with a median of $2.67).

During their relatively short work careers in the urban area (from 5 to 20 years) these men had found it useful or necessary to make a number of place of work changes. One migrant, in fact, had worked for 13 different employers during his 15 years in Ohio; six migrants, on the other hand, were still in the same factory where they had started and were apparently quite satisfied. The median number of employer changes for this representative group of 30 male migrants is three. More significantly, the median length of time they had held their current (1962) jobs was over four years; in fact, the man (mentioned above) who had exhibited the most "unstable" pattern had, nevertheless, worked for his current employer for more than two years.

Beech Creekers in Ohio, then, had manifested some degree of, occupational "restlessness" but most of this seems to have occurred early in their work careers. Perhaps it was a function of youth, or represented the rural migrants way of "testing" his abilities on the urban labor market, or maybe it was linked with social-psychological changes that had come about as a result of migration. In any event, although relatively frequent job changes appear to have been the norm during the initial period of transition that followed migration from the mountains, the later period of a Beech Creeker's work career had become markedly stabilized. He had, it seems, found his place in the industrial order — a niche that was in reasonable accord with his talents and ambitions.

One additional point is especially relevant here: Most male migrants from Beech Creek, as noted earlier, secured their initial jobs in Ohio through the aid or influence of kinfolk. Those who subsequently changed jobs — and most of them did — more likely did so "on their own" without help from kinfolk. After having been exposed to the urban occupational sub-culture for a period of time and having become familiar

with the industrial work situation, Beech Creekers were in a much better position to personally pursue and evaluate job opportunities in light of their own occupational aspirations. Changing jobs at that time was not of the same order of crises as finding the first job; individualism, not familism, was the appropriate orientation called forth in this situation.[12]

REACTION TO LAY-OFFS

The threat of being "laid-off" (i.e., an involuntary, though temporary loss of job for a period ranging anywhere from one week to six months or longer) is an ever-present fact of life among manual workers especially those employed in manufacturing and construction industries. A great many Beech Creekers (over half of those interviewed during this phase of our study) had experienced a "lay-off" at some time during their industrial work careers. The economic recession of 1957-58 was a particularly difficult time. More commonly, however, lay-off periods were normally associated with massive re-tooling operations or production "change-overs" such as occur, for example, every two or three years in the automobile industries. To be sure, a Beech Creeker now and then "quit" or was "fired" for personal reasons or for reasons of incompetency. But the lay-off pattern, either as an actuality or as a threat, was a prevailing norm in the industrial work situation of Ohio during the 1950's and early 1960's, and we shall confine our brief remarks to this form of unemployment and the Beech Creekers' reactions to it. Their reactions (in retrospect) ranged from a deep sense of frustration on the part of a few to the more typical attitude of regarding a lay-off period as a vacation and a chance to do some work around the house or to visit with the family in the mountains.

In general, Beech Creekers accept the threat of a lay-off as one of those annoying conditions of industrial work like punching a time-clock and working indoors, that has to be tolerated much like the vagaries of weather has to be tolerated in farming. As a worker gains seniority on the job, of course, the threat is reduced; men hired last are the first to be "bumped". But even those with considerable seniority are attitudinally prepared for the eventuality: they too may be included in the next round of lay-offs. Most Beech Creekers feel fairly secure in the knowledge that unemployment compensation will hold them over in good stead; if a lay-off period turns into chronic unemployment, for whatever reason, they can always return to the mountains and wait out the crises on the family homestead.

During a lay-off period, then, Beech Creekers try to make the best of it. They draw unemployment compensation, attempt to find other jobs (as they must under existing regulations), and wait for their old jobs to reopen. In the meantime, they have an opportunity to visit kinfolk in the mountains and in the surrounding Ohio communities, to do chores around the house, work in the garden, fix up the back porch, go fishing, or simply to loaf. There is no question that the Beech Creeker, in his own way, has found it rather easy to adapt to this potentially disturbing feature of industrial work life.

ATTITUDE TOWARD UNIONS

The Beech Creeker supports union activities in much the same way as does the majority of rank and file union members in American industry. His general opinion of union activities is on the whole favorable; his participation in union activities is in most cases minimal. The Beech Creeker's attitudinal support tends to focus on the "practical" functions of unionism; i.e., so-called "bread and butter unionism", such as protection of the worker from arbitrary acts of management that can result in loss of job or pay. In many ways he is like the American workingman described by Schneider, who "expects his union to secure for him (1) above all, better wages; (2) more favorable hours; (3) job tenure; and (4) congenial work rules and conditions of work".[13]

In spite of this basically favorable attitude, a general (behavioral) apathy nevertheless prevails. Practical issues are rarely regarded as sufficiently important for personal involvement. There appears to be an undercurrent of fear of managerial reprisal for active union involvement, especially among older migrants; as a matter of fact, one Beech Creeker had indeed lost his job as a result of union organizing activities. Moreover, Beech Creekers just aren't very good joiners; they feel uncomfortable in a formal gathering. Participation in union meetings and activities outside of the immediate job situation tends to interfere with home life and most Beech

Creekers are unwilling to allow this to happen unless such union activity involves and serves the needs of the whole family. One man, for example, reported that he used to take his family to all appropriate union events but had ceased to do so because these events often become "beer blasts". Of the 30 men interviewed during this phase of our field study, 16 were union members but only four were active in the sense of having attended a number of union meetings the previous year. For most Beech Creekers, union membership is a nominal status.

On occasion a Beech Creeker may voice some negative comments about unions: "You don't get anything for the dues you pay"; "You take a gripe to the shop steward and that's the last you hear of it"; "If you do your job right and work hard, you don't need a union"; "I think someone ought to crack down on both the union and management. They spend too much money fighting each other when they could be helping the worker."

Most Beech Creekers, however, do not seem to question the right or place of unions in the industry. Although generally apathetic about getting involved with union activities, Beech Creekers, like rank and file union members elsewhere, are passive advocates of pragmatic unionism.[14] They accept union membership in much the same way as they accept other, more discomforting aspects of factory work life, and they obey union dictums in much the same way as they obey shop regulations or the orders of a foreman. Whether a Beech Creeker's initial motivation to join derived from his employment in a factory that was bound by a union shop contract (in which case new workers must join the union within a stipulated time, usually thirty days after being hired) or from informal pressures by co-workers who insisted that "to be a union member is to be a right guy", further involvement (attending meetings, assuming a leadership role, proselytizing, etc.) demands an emotional or intellectual commitment over and above that for which the Beech Creeker is prepared. In that respect the Beech Creeker is not very different from other Appalachian migrants and from the majority of American industrial workers. His apathy is mixed with allegiance. Indeed, one might say that he has adapted to the form of industrial work life without having become uncomfortably involved in its complexities.

JOB SATISFACTIONS

Among American workers generally, the pattern of responses to such questions as, "taking into consideration all the things about your job, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with it?" invariably indicates a high degree of satisfaction.[15] Similarly, virtually all employed Beech Creekers in Ohio (survey phase of study) say they are quite satified with their current jobs. Of course, the meaning of "satisfaction" is inherently vague;[16] during the focused interviewing phase of our study, therefore, we pursued this aspect of occupation adaptation a bit further.

Most of our informants (male migrants from Beech Creek) emphasive that they like the kind of work they are doing because it is "interesting" or they are "learning something different". They talk a lot about the working conditions; it is "clean work" or they are working with a "nice crew". The amount of takehome pay, of course, and the degree of security accorded (in the form of seniority rights, adequate compensation during lay-off periods, etc.) are important considerations in assessing the job situation. But pay and security factors are fairly standardized in terms of skill levels among the industries in southern Ohio; hence, if dissatisfactions about a particular job exist they usually focus upon specific working conditions and especially the interpersonal relationships among work crew members and with the boss. As one foreman explained: "They are very sensitive to the kidding from other workers. Then too, they seem to have a holy fear of the boss. After about six months they adapt to the kidding but it seems to be a general characteristic that they are more afraid of the boss than other workers." Another foreman put it more strongly: "They don't like to be bossed and they seem to be afraid or shy in front of the boss. Then, too, you have to ask them to do the work rather than tell them". To the highly individualistic, personalistically-oriented Beech Creeker, social relationships with fellow workers and immediate supervisors are a major source of potential strain; the fact that most Beech Creekers work with other Appalachian migrants from similar socio-cultural origins contributes to the stability and, from the Beech Creek's point-of-view, satisfactoriness of the work situation.

Advancement opportunities would certainly be a factor in the overall evaluation of any job;

here too Beech Creekers are quite satisfied. Few feel "trapped" or "held down"; few feel that their job is a "dead-end". In general they seem aware of existing opportunities. Those who have attained skilled levels feel they might eventually move on to supervisory or "office" positions. Those who are at semi-skilled levels, although cognizant of opportunities and confident of their abilities to attain higher levels, apparently perfer (so they say) to avoid the "headaches" and responsibilities that inevitably accompany higher rated jobs. Laborers, on the other hand, more often than not simply feel that further advancement is not important, especially if it means (as it often does) giving up the security of the moment for the uncertainties of occupational mobility. Beech Creek migrants, in these respects, are not unlike American industrial workers in general; over the years, undoubtedly, a sorting-out along the lines of relative ambition and talent has occurred.

The basic satisfaction with job and work situation is further reinforced by, on the other hand, the migrant's favorable attitude toward management (a naive-like trust whose roots, perhaps, are to be found in the patriarchical tendencies of mountain society) and, on the other hand, the migrant's conviction that employers in Ohio are quite satisfied with the work performance of Appalachian people. Indeed, most Beech Creekers feel that factory supervisors consider mountaineers to be "better and harder workers" than native Ohioans. The personnel managers and foremen whom we interviewed tend to validate the Beech Creekers' own favorable self-image **vis-a-vis** hard work; but they add, often in the same breath, that the mountaineers appears to be a bit too docile for his own good in the industrial labor market.

OCCUPATIONAL ADAPTATION IN CONTEXT

Beech Creek men who had migrated to Ohio had been able, over the years, to make a satisfactory and, as they see it, satisfying transition "from field to factory". In the process, it seems, they did not encounter, and therefore did not find it necessary to cope with those difficult tension-producing conditions that are so often associated with rural to urban migration and the phenomena of industrialization in other parts of the world. Their record of upward occupational mobility in the urban area, which we regard as impressive under the circumstances, and their relatively long tenure in current jobs, which we regard as a sign that stability has been normalized, attest to their confidence in and acceptance of the industrial work role, and their successful adaptation to the industrial work situation.

Initially, of course, the migrants had encountered some difficulties as beginning workers. The formal schedule and rigid authority system of the factory, for example, was particularly irksome, and working with and around complicated machines was for many quite confusing and sometimes even frightening at first. Yet these men, reared in an isolated mountain locality of Appalachia, few of whom had been fortunate enough to get beyond the eighth grade in school, were able, after a relatively short period of time, to master the technical details of their new jobs, to familiarize themselves with the industrial arts and the formalized procedures of factory work and, indeed, to feel rather comfortable in the midst of industrial complexity. Perhaps, during the transitional period, their frontier-bred fortitude and willingness to work hard had compensated in part for their initial lack of skills on the job. Other factors, such as the labor market situation at that time, must be considered in venturing an explanation of why the process of adaptation in this case was not more difficult and disturbing. We, however, chose to focus our inquiry on the kinship factor which we believe offers a valid, though partial, explanation of the relative "success" of Beech Creekers as industrial workers.

The stem-family form of kinship structure, a vital part of the social organization of rural Appalachian society, helped to stimulate outmigration from the mountains, directed and "cushioned" the relocation of Beech Creekers, and facilitated, in various ways, the entry of migrants into the industrial work situation. Through the kin network, information about jobs and working conditions in the area of destination were made known to potential migrants in the mountain neighborhoods. Kinfolk in the host community assisted newcomers in finding the initial jobs and, thereafter, served as advisors and instructors in the process of urbanizing their "greenhorn" kinsmen. More important, the "branch-family network" in the area of destination, which is linked directly with the family

homestead in the mountains, provided the newcomer with a measure of assurance that, in the event of some unforeseen crises, he would not stand alone. The Beech Creek stem-family system, in short, served to stabilize the migrant's social world external to the factory and, consequently, helped to keep "off-the-job" problems and anxieties from entering into and disturbing the migrant's "on-the-job" performance. (If the Beech Creek kin system had been a more nucleated form, the migrant worker, we believe, would have experienced greater difficulty in adapting to the industrial work situation and, as a consequence, factory managers in the area would have had many more labor problems and far greater labor costs. The contribution of Appalachian mountain families to the economy of Ohio, other states, **and** the larger society that resulted from extended family normative obligations "to take care of their own", if it could be measured, would undoubtedly stagger the imagination of many government officials.)

In the Beech Creek case, perhaps, the most abrupt, immediate change (i.e., system-disturbing change) that occurred and was experienced by the Beech Creeker as a result of migration was the distinct separation of occupational activities from family activities. For many of the sociocultural elements characteristic of the Beech Creek neighborhoods had been transferred to (or recreated within) the area of destination via chain-migration of kinsfolk and neighbors over the years. Furthermore, a kind of residential segregation has given rise to a number of "little Appalchia" neighborhoods in and around the major metropolitan centers of southern Ohio. The host neighborhood in the area of destination is, therefore, very often structured in the image (sociocultural) of a mountain community, and because kinsfolk are near at hand, the newcomer from Beech Creek is, in many respects, "at home".

For most Beech Creekers, then, the abrupt separation of family life from work life was, in the normative sense, the biggest change that had come about as a result of moving to Ohio. Some men, to be sure, had been employed off the farm in "public work" prior to migration. But, as we have explained, this was generally defined as a temporary activity, peripheral to the family work activity configuration, and often undertaken on a seasonal basis; farming, for most of these men, continued to be the main enterprise and management of the homestead and its lands the primary obligation. That attitude had to be and was modified in confrontation with the industrial situation. After migration, work for wages in a shop or factory became the family's only means of support, and a man's job (about which his wife had little comprehension) became, without question, his primary responsibility.

Adaptation to an industrial occupation role, therefore, undoubtedly had some stress-producing potential because Beech Creekers were not well prepared for this experience and its immediate and obvious consequences. Yet the potential, so far as can be discerned, was not manifested to any unusual degree (e.g. through instances of marital discord, criminal behavior, alcoholism, mental illness).[7] Supportive functions performed by the kin network, we believe, had much to do with keeping resultant tensions within manageable bounds. Moreover, because the kin network tended to isolate the newcomer from other segments of the urban community, it tended to perpetuate the Beech Creek value system and to provide the migrant with a means for self-expr ssion and for the satisfaction of culturally-derived needs. Adaptation, then, to the industrial occupation role required merely the acceptance of new standards in an isolated area of behavior, namely work; it had little effect upon other and to them more important areas of life. The tensions aroused by these "minor" changes in the migrants's life were more than adequately compensated for by the obvious rewards which were forthcoming. Over time, of course, these same "minor" changes may build into system-disturbing influences which affect more fundamental changes; at that point the Beech Creek sociocultural system will have been absorbed into the great "melting pot" of American Society.

FOOTNOTES

1. This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Conference on Migration and Behavioral Deviance, Puerto Rico, November 4-8, 1968. It is one of a series of papers from the Beech Creek Study sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health in cooperation with the Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station. The study was designed and directed in collaboration with James S. Brown of the University of Kentucky, Joseph J. Mangalam now of the University of Guelph, and Martin Jay Crowe now of the University of Colorado.
2. For an extensive bibliography used in conjunction with the design of this study, see Joseph J. Mangalam, *Human Migration*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1969. For a sociological perspective on the problem of rural to urban migration, see Joseph J. Mangalam and Harry K. Schwarzweller, "General Theory in the Study of Migration: Current Needs and Difficulties," *International Migration Review*, 3 (Fall, 1968), pp. 3-18; Joseph J. Mangalam and Harry K. Schwarzweller, "Some Theoretical Guidelines Toward a Sociology of Migration," *International Migration Review*, 3 (Spring, 1969), forthcoming.
3. Specifically, this refers to the process of adaptation by rural migrants to occupational roles (i.e., changes in and demands of) within the industrial work situation.
4. James S. Brown, Harry K. Schwarzweller and Joseph J. Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem Family: An American Variation on a Theme by LePlay," *Rural Sociology*, 28 (March, 1963), pp. 48-69. See also Harry K. Schwarzweller and John F. Seggar, "Kinship Involvement: A Factor in the Adjustment of Rural Migrants," *Joural of Marriage and the Family*, 29 (November, 1967), pp. 662-671; Harry K. Schwarzweller and James S. Brown, "Social Class Origins, Rural-Urban Migration, and Economic Life Chances: A Case Study," *Rural Sociology*, 32 (March, 1967), pp. 5-19.
5. Martin Jay Crowe, *The Occupational Adaptation of a Selected Group of Eastern Kentuckians in Southern Ohio*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1964.
6. See James S. Brown, "The Social Organization of an Isolated Kentucky Mountain Neighborhood," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Cambridge: Harvard University, 1950; *The Family Group in a Kentucky Mountain Farming Community*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Ag. Exp. Sta., Bull. 588, June, 1952; *The Farm Family in a Kentucky Mountain Neighborhood*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Agr. Exp. Sta., Bull. 587, August, 1952; and "The Conjugal Family and the Extended Family Group," *American Sociological Review*, 17 (June, 1952).
7. In addition to focused interview data reported here and findings from the survey phase of the Beech Creek Study, information and insights were also gained by the research staff during three months of residence and quasi-participant observation of selected migrant families in a migrant community in Ohio.
8. Reported by Crowe, *op. cit.*
9. Brown, Schwarzweller and Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration—," *op. cit.*
10. To be sure, there exists much confusion over the meanings and proper usages of terms such as adaptation, adjustment and accommodation. For the exploratory purposes of this study we have defined "occupational adaptation" as a process by which an individual approaches, evaluates and accepts a new occupational role. This definition was intended as a research guide, not as a conceptual clarification. See Crowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-26, and Joseph J. Mangalam, "A Reconsideration of the Notion of Adjustment," *Proceedings*, Southern Agricultural Workers Conference, Jacksonville, Florida, 1962.
11. James S. Slotkin, *From Field to Factory*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960, pp. 99-100.
12. For some background information on the value-orientations of Appalachian people, see James S. Brown, *The Social Organization of an Isolated Kentucky Mountain Neighborhood*, Harvard University, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1950, pp. 380-401; Thomas R. Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism," in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962, pp. 9-34; and Jack E. Weller, *Yesterday's People*, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1965, pp. 28-57.
13. Eugene V. Schneider, *Industrial Sociology*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957, p. 305.
14. The best documented exception are members of the International Typographical Union. See: Seymour M. Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman, *Union Democracy*, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1962.
15. See, for example, Robert Hoppock, *Job Satisfaction*, New York: Harper, 1935; Joseph Shister and L. G. Reynolds, *Job Horizonss A Study of Job Satisfaction and Labor Mobility*, New York: Harper, 1949; Nancy C. Morse and S. Weiss, "The Function and Meaning of Work and Job," *American Sociological Review*, 20, (April, 1955); Gladys L. Palmer, "Attitudes Toward Work in an Industrial Community," *American Journal of Sociology*, 63 (July, 1957). See also: J. C. Brown, *The Social Psychology of Industry*, Baltimore: English Pelican Edition, 1954, pp. 190-191, who points out that American research supports the generalization that, "Even under the existing conditions, which are far from satisfactory, most workers like their jobs. Every survey of workers' attitudes which has been carried out, no matter in what industry, indicates that this is so."
16. Drucker, for example, argues that "Satisfaction as such is a measureless and meaningless word." See Peter Drucker, *The Practice of Management*, New York: Harper, 1954, p. 303.
17. For a more detailed discussion and conceptual clarification of the stem and branch-family form of migration, see Brown, Schwarzweller and Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration—," *op. cit.*
18. This is *not* to say that behavioral deviancy is not associated with migration, nor that marital discord, crime, alcoholism, mental illness, and other signs of unmanaged tension are absent in migrant neighborhoods and "Ghettos". To the contrary, there is much evidence to suggest that migration fosters the kinds of social conditions and situational circumstances from which deviant behaviors emerge. What we are saying is that where the family-kin network intervenes as a stabilizing instrumentality, as it did in the Beech Creek case, the individual migrant is more likely to remain anchored into a normative system which discourages deviancies. This is not a new idea: see, for example, William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, New York: Dover Publications, rev. ed., 1958; Carle C. Zimmerman and Merle E. Frampton, *Family and Society: A Study of the Sociology of Reconstruction*, New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1935; and Frederic LePlay, *Les ouvriers europeens*, 2nd ed., 6 volumes, Paris: Tours A. Mame et fils, 1878.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY BULLETIN
Series 69 No. 12-7 June 1969
Second Class postage paid at
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506